

The Site of Karṇa Suvarṇa.—By H. BEVERIDGE, B. C. S. (RETIRED).

Hiuen Tsiang, the Buddhist pilgrim, visited a town in Bengal which is spelt in Chinese, Kie-la-na-su-fa-la-na. M. Stanislaus Julien transliterates* this into the Sanscrit words *Karṇa Suvarṇa*, which may mean Karṇa the Golden, or Golden Ear, or simply, wearing gold earrings.† So far as I am aware, the site has not yet been satisfactorily identified, although it has been conjectured, chiefly from the similarity of name, that it lay on the Suvarṇa Rekhá, or Streak of Gold, a river which traverses Midnapur, and used to be the boundary between Bengal and Orissa. Some have placed it in Bírbbhúm, and some in Singhbhúm; and quite recently Dr. Waddell,‡ has suggested that it lay close to Burdwan and is the place now known as Kañchanagar. My chief object in this paper is to show that Karṇa Suvarṇa is probably identical with Raṅgamáṭí, in the Murshidábád district, and situated on the right bank of the Bhágíráthí, about six miles below Berhampur. But before I discuss this point, I am obliged to say a few words about the records of Hiuen Tsiang's travels.

It is well known that we have two accounts of his journeying. One is called the Si-yu-ki, or Descriptions of Western Countries, the other is his biography by Hwui-li and Yen-Tsung. The Si-yu-ki is in twelve books, and is regarded as the original and more authoritative account. It was not, however, entirely drawn up by Hiuen Tsiang. He gave the materials, but the composition is by one Pien-ki. M. Julien conjectures that Hiuen Tsiang's absence from China for seventeen years had made it difficult for him to write his mother tongue with the elegance required by Chinese officialism, and so the task was assigned to another monk. The biography is in ten books, and is mainly the work of Hwui-li. Both he and his continuator were contemporaries of Hiuen Tsiang, and as M. Julien remarks, their work is the livelier and more interesting of the two. It is also, I understand, written with greater elegance. That it is more interesting can easily be understood, for it is a biography and a record of Hiuen Tsiang's adventures; whereas the Si-yu-ki is a sort of *gazetteer* or treatise on geography. It is necessary to give these details because there is a remarkable discrepancy between the two records about the route by which Hiuen Tsiang reached Karṇa Suvarṇa, and it is desirable to decide which account should have the preference.

* III. 84. Beal's translation, II, 201.

† II. 248n. At 250 l. c. the Chinese translation Kin-eul is used.

‡ See note at end of this paper.

The following two tables of routes show where the discrepancy lies:—

Places.	Direction and distance, in miles.	Remarks.
<i>Route according to the Si-yu-ki.</i>		I have reckoned the <i>li</i> as one-fifth of a mile, though it is a little more. Champá is Bhágálpur. Kajúghíra, or Kajíngara, has not been identified. Lassen points out that according to the biography, (I. 237, *) it lay partly at least, N. of the Ganges, though according to both the routes it lay on the W. bank. It is perhaps the Kajuráhi, or Kharjura-bhága (Sachau I. 202), of Albirúní, which he puts as 30 <i>farsákh</i> east of Kananj. Sir A. Cunningham suggests Kánkjol, but the resemblance is only in position. M. Saini Martin suggests the Cudjiry or Kajiri in Rennel's map (No. 15 of Atlas), near Farúkhábád, and opposite Gauṛ. The first part of the word may be connected with <i>khajur</i> , a date tree. In going to Pauṇḍra Vardhana, Hiuen Tsiang crossed the Ganges from west to east. In all probability Mr. Westmacott's suggestion that the place is Paṇḍuá, in Maldah, is correct. There is a river in this neighbourhood, and also according to Rennel, a town, called Púrñabhába, which sounds like Pauṇḍra Vardhana. On his way to Kámruṇ, Hiuen Tsiang crossed a great river. This should be the Brahmáputra, but it is curious that he does not name it. The mention of Náráyaṇ as the ancestor of the royal family, seems to indicate that the place visited was Koch Bihár and not Assam proper. Samataṭa (level shore) is the Ganges delta. The two routes agree as far as Pauṇḍra Vardhana. The direct distance from Pauṇḍra to Raṅgamáti is about 75 miles. The direction is nearly due south, but if, as seems probable, Hiuen Tsiang started from the monastery of Váchpa (? Vásibhá) (I. 180 and III. 75) † 24 <i>li</i> to the west, then the direction of Raṅgamáti would be S. S. E. The delta is E. S. E. from Raṅgamáti, and the direct distance about 180 miles. The direct distance from the seaface of the delta to Tamluk is about the same. The capital of Samataṭa is not known, but if Saśáñka was a descendant of Káśísúr, it might be Dacca or Sonárgáoñ. Samataṭa extended to the sea shore, but as it was bounded on N. E. by Sylhet (I. 182 and III. 82), it must have extended inland as far as Dacca.
Champá	
Kajúghíra	E. 80 ...	
Pauṇḍra Vardhana	E. 120 ...	
Kámruṇ	E. 180 ...	
Samataṭa	S. 260 ...	
Tamluk	W. 180	
Karṇa Suvarṇa	N. W. 140 ...	
Orissa	S. W. 140 ..	
<i>Route according to the Biography.</i>		
Pauṇḍra Vardhana	
Karṇa Suvarṇa	S. E. 140 ...	
Samataṭa	S. E. Not given	
Tamluk	W. 183 ...	
Orissa	S. W. Not given	

* Beal's translation, p. 131.

† Beal's Si-yu-ki, II, 195; Life, 131.

It will be seen that the Si-yu-ki makes Hiuen Tsiang diverge into Kám-rúp (Assam) and arrive at Karna Suvarṇa from Tamluk. But the biography makes no mention here of the Assam visit, and brings Hiuen Tsiang direct from Pauṇḍra Vardhana, or from Váchpá (? Vásibhá) to Karna Suvarṇa. M. Vivien de Saint Martin has pointed out the discrepancy in the note appended to M. Julien's third volume (p. 389). His idea is that the Si-yu-ki version should be unhesitatingly preferred because it is the primary account, and because it is more complete and consistent than that of Hwui-li.* But, as we have seen, neither account is exactly primary, and perhaps too M. Saint Martin has overlooked the difference in the character of the two works. The Si-yu-ki is a geographical treatise, and so all the information about each country is put in one place, whether the traveller visited it once or twice. For a similar reason, the order of visiting was, perhaps, not always exactly observed, though I have not found another instance of this. The biography on the other hand, joins the various journeys as they occurred. For instance, it describes Hiuen Tsiang as twice visiting Magadha or South Bihár; once on his way to Bengal and again on his return from Southern India, and after he had visited Gujrát, Sindh, and Mathurá. But the Si-yu-ki says nothing about the second visit. It also contains accounts of twenty-eight countries † which Hiuen Tsiang did not visit. It is therefore much less of a personal narrative than the biography is. The latter contains (Book V.) a detailed account of the Assam visit and of what had led to it. But it represents it as occurring after the second visit to Magadha, and it seems likely that Hiuen Tsiang went direct from Magadha to Assam, both because it was the shortest route, and because it was when he was at Nálanda that the Ambassadors from Kám-rúp came to him. It was there, too, that Sílabhadrá urged his compliance with the invitation. Dr. Fergusson (J. R. A. S. VI. 252,) has also noticed the discrepancy between the two accounts. He believes that Hwui-li is more correct about the date and manner of the visit to Assam, but still he holds that he is wrong about the journey to Karna Suvarṇa!

There can be no question that the route through Bengal given in the biography is the more natural one of the two. It brings the traveller down to the delta along the course of the Ganges (in those days the Bhágíráthí was probably the main stream), and then takes him west and south *via* Tamluk and Orissa. The Si-yu-ki on the other hand,

* At p. 365, l. c. M. Saint Martin in noticing another discrepancy between the two accounts gives the preference to the itinerary in the biography.

† The Si-yu-ki describes 138 countries, but Hiuen Tsiang only visited 110. Saint Martin, I. App.

makes Hiuen Tsiang diverge to the north-east,* or Pauṇḍra Vardhana, and also causes him to describe two sides of a nearly equilateral triangle, between Tamluk and Orissa. This may be seen from M. Saint Martin's map where, however, the route is made still more awkward by his supposition that Pauṇḍra Vardhana is Burdwan. This it cannot be, for the itinerary places it on the east of the Ganges.† It is rightly placed there in the Chino-Japanese map of 1710, of which M. Julien has given a reduction. It seems very unlikely, too, that Hiuen Tsiang would turn inland and to the N. W. after arriving at Tamluk. Presumably he went there in order to embark for Ceylon, as his predecessor Fa-Hian had done. The biography, at all events, tells us‡ that he designed when at Tamluk, to sail to Ceylon and that he was dissuaded from doing so by a monk from southern India. This man advised him not to attempt so long and dangerous a navigation, but to sail from the S. W. point of India, whence he could make the journey in three days. This would give him an opportunity, the monk added, of visiting the sacred places of Orissa and other kingdoms, Hiuen Tsiang took this advice and started for the S. W. and arrived at Orissa. This is all straightforward; whereas the going to Karṇa Suvarṇa from Tamluk involved a *détour* of at least 140 miles.

For these reasons I am disposed to prefer the route given in the biography. I am not sure, however, if this is to the advantage of my contention that Karṇa Suvarṇa is Raṅgamāṭī. Neither route is discordant with the identification, but the Si-yu-ki one is more detailed. Raṅgamāṭī§ is nearly due north of Tamluk and 120 or 130 miles off, and the borders of Orissa are about an equal distance to the S. W. of Raṅgamāṭī. We must not press Hiuen Tsiang's measurements closely, for we do not know the exact length of the *li*, nor do we always know to what points he refers. He generally speaks only of countries, not of towns, and it may be that the distances are those to and from the confines of kingdoms.

* It describes the direction as easterly, but Koch Bihār and Kámruṇ lie N. E. from Paṇḍuá.

† It seems a happy suggestion of Mr. Westmacott's that the name Pauṇḍra is preserved in Abú'l Fazl's "Sarkár of Panjra." The chief objection to the identification of Paṇḍuá with Pauṇḍra Vardhana seems to be that the central or home-farm pargana of Sarkár Panjra, *viz.*, Havelí Panjra, lies N. E. of Dinájpur and far from Paṇḍuá which apparently is in Shashhazári. [Áin, III, XV; Vol. II, p. 136 of Col. Jarrott's translation where it is called Sarkár Pinjarah. Ed.]

‡ I. 183.

§ There are several Raṅgamāṭís, and the best known, perhaps, is that in Lower Assam. But the one we have to do with is in Central Bengal and on the Bhágíráthí. Sir H. Yule suggested that it might be the Kartasina of Ptolemy.

I now come to the principal object of my paper.

Hinen Tsiang's accounts of Karṇa Suvarṇa are to be found at I. 181 and III. 84-88, of M. Julien's work.* He describes the kingdom as having a circumference of about 900 miles, and the capital as being about four miles round. The country was fertile and populous, and produced all kinds of fruit and flowers. The inhabitants were well off and had literary tastes, but they were a mixture of true believers (Buddhists), and heretics. There were thirteen monasteries, including those which followed the ritual of Devadatta, and there were fifty Hindú temples. Then comes the description which I rely upon: "By the side of the capital there rises the monastery called Lo-to-wei-chi-seng-kia-lan. Its halls are spacious and well-lighted, and its towers and pavilions are lofty. All the men of this kingdom who are distinguished for their talents, their learning and their intelligence, assemble in this monastery."

Lo-to-wei-chi-seng-kia-lan is, according to M. Julien, the phonetic rendering of the Sanskrit words *Raktaviṭi Saṅghārāma*, i. e., the monastery of Redlands, and the word *Raktaviṭi* is, I submit, merely a synonym for Raṅgamāṭi. Saṅghārāma is the Buddhist word for a monastery, its original meaning being the grove, or enclosed garden of the congregation. Wei-chi is phonetic for *viṭi*, and Lo-to for *rakta* (blood,) and M. Julien and Mr. Beal agree in translating Lo-to-wei-chi as meaning red earth, one saying "*limon rouge*," and the other, "red mud." In his Index, III. 468, M. Julien uses a still more appropriate word for he renders wei-chi by "argile" or clay. Every one who has seen Raṅgamāṭi knows that its remarkable feature is the cliffs or bluffs of red clay. These extend for miles, are from 30 to 40 ft. high, and formed the bank of the river in the days when the Bhágirathí was the main stream of the Ganges. I must acknowledge that I have not been able to find in the Sanscrit dictionary the word *Viṭi*, though it is clear from the Chinese translation that it means earth. *Raktaviṭi* would, of course, mean red, but I suppose that the Sanskrit equivalent of Raṅgamāṭi would be *Rāgamṛittika* or *Raktamṛittika*. Possibly *mṛittiká* or *mṛitti* was what Hinen Tsiang wrote, for in the biography† the word is given as Ki-to-mo-chi for which M. Julien substitutes, in accordance with the Si-yu-ki, Lo-to-wei-chi. But *mo-chi* may be right and may be phonetic for *mṛitti*. However this may be, I submit that the facts of the monastery being known by the name of Redlands and of Karṇasuvārṇaṅgarha, i. e., the golden fortress of Karṇa, being the traditional name of Raṅgamāṭi, are almost conclusive of the latter's being the place visited by Hinen Tsiang.

* Beal, Life, 131, Si-yu-ki, II, 201.

† I. 181; Beal's translation, 132.

It is unnecessary for me to dwell on the evidence of Raṅgamāṭī's having once been a great city. This may be found in the paper of Col. Wilford in the 9th volume of the Asiatic Researches, p. 39, and in the descriptions by Capt. Layard, and Mr. Long. Capt. Layard's paper is in the 22nd volume of our Society's *Journal*, p. 281. He gives the name as Kansonapurī or Kurn-sona-ka-ghur, but Lassen * says the proper spelling is Karṇa suvarṇa gaḍa. As noticed by Capt. Layard there is a mound at Raṅgamāṭī, known as the Demon's Mount. This is probably a Buddhist *stupa* and should be excavated. There is also a story of a large signet-ring having been picked up on or near the mount, and having been taken to England. The local legend about the prosperity of the place, and the origin of the title Suvarṇa is that Vibhīṣhaṇa, the brother of Rāvaṇa, visited the place on the occasion of the king's son's first meal of rice, and caused a shower of gold to fall on the land. It will be shown hereafter that there are other legends connecting the place with Ceylon. The Si-yu-ki goes on to tell how Buddhism was introduced into Karṇa Suvarṇa. It says that at a time when the people did not yet know the religion of Buddha, a heretical teacher came from the South of India and "beat the drum of discussion." His belly was covered with plates of copper, and he carried a torch on his head.† When asked why he was so attired,

* III. 766 n.

† Reinaud in his "Memoir on India before the 11th Century," Paris 1849, p. 293, quotes an account from an Arabic work, the *Kitābu'l-fihrist*, of an Indian sect who took their name from the practice of girdling their bodies with iron hoops. Every one who wished to enter this sect had to make a vow of sincerity and humility. He was obliged to have attained a certain degree of perfection before he could don the iron girdle. This girdle, according to the members of the sect, prevented the body from bursting with excess of knowledge, and power of contemplation.

The *Kitābu'l-fihrist* was written in 377 A. H., or 987 A. D., but it refers to an account of the Indian religions, which had been given by a man who had been sent in the last half of the eighth century by Yahya, the son of Khalad the Barmecide, to explore India. This account had been copied out by the famous Al-Kindī in 863 A. D. [Mr. C. J. Lyall, the President of the Society, has been kind enough to contribute the following note on this point:—

The passage in the *Fihrist*, to which M. Reinaud refers, is at p. 348, Vol. I, of Flügel's edition, (M. Reinaud wrote long before the publication of the text, and relied only on one faulty MS.). It runs thus—

و منهم اهل ملقة يقال لهم البكرتينية يعني المصفدين انفسهم بالحديد و سنتهم انهم يحلقون رؤوسهم و لجامهم ويعرون اجسادهم ما خلا العورة و ليس من سنتهم ان يعلموا احدا ولا يكلموه دون ان يدخل في دينهم و يامرون من يدخل في دينهم بالصدقة للتواضع بها و من دخل في دينهم لم يصفد بالحديد حتى يبلغ المرتبة التي

he said that he had studied much, and had great wisdom, and so was afraid that he would burst; and that he carried a torch because he was moved with pity for the blindness of men. Ten days passed without any one being able to cope with him in argument. The king was in despair and said, "In the whole of my states are there no enlightened men? If no one can answer the difficult questions of this stranger, it will be a great disgrace for my kingdom. We must search again, and in the most obscure places." Then some one said, that there was an extraordinary *śramaṇa* who lived in a forest. The king went in person to bring him. The *śramaṇa* said that he, too, came from Southern India; and that his learning was but small. However, he would endeavour to satisfy the king on condition that, if he was not worsted, the king would build a monastery, and send for monks to promulgate the law of Buddha. The king assented, and the *śramaṇa* came to the hall of discussion. The heretical doctor produced a writing containing 30,000 words, but, in spite of his profundity and science, he was vanquished by the *śramaṇa* after a hundred words, and had to retire in disgrace. Thereon the king fulfilled his promise of building a monastery, and has since that time, says the biography, zealously propagated the teachings of the law. In the preface of the Si-yu-ki* there is an allusion to the copper-sheathed belly which seems to imply that Hiuen Tsiang was the victorious *śramaṇa*, but as M. Julien remarks, this does not agree with the account in the body of the work.

Probably the king who built the monastery was Śilāditya (the Sun of Righteousness), the Buddhist ruler of Kanauj.† The expression

يستحق بها ذلك وتصفيدهم انفسهم من اوساطهم الى صدورهم لئلا يذشق بطونهم
 زعموا من كثرة العلم وغلبة الفكر *

In English:—

"Among them is a sect called the Bakrantinis (*sic*: conjectured to be Bakrabantīya, = Vajrabandhīya), that is to say, those who chain themselves with iron chains. Their custom is to shave their heads and faces and to go naked, except as to their private parts. It is their rule not to instruct anyone, or to speak with him, until he spontaneously becomes a member of their sect. And they enjoin upon those accepting their religion to do alms in order that their pride may be humbled. One who joins their body does not put on the iron chains until he reaches the degree which entitles him to do so. They wear the chains from their waists to their breasts, as a protection against the bursting of their bellies—so they say—from excess of knowledge and stress of thought."

The conjecture Vajrabandhīya is Haarbrücker's (see *Fihrist*, Vol. II, p. 183). The passage appears to recur in Shahrīstāū's *Kitābu-n-Nihāl wal-Mīlāl*, p. 449.—Ed.]

* II. XXXVII; Beal's translation, I, 4.

† Possibly however it was Pūrṇavarman of Magadha and who according to Hiuen Tsiang was the last descendant of Aśoka.

“in my states” seems to imply that he ruled over more than one kingdom. It is not likely that Śaśāṅka, the Hindú king of Karna Suvarṇa, would allow the introduction of Buddhism into his capital. I presume then that Hiuen Tsiang’s visit was made after Śaśāṅka had been overcome by Śíláditya.

There are seven other referenees * to Karna Suvarṇa or to one of its kings. From them we learn that this king was called Śaśāṅka, *i. e.*, the moon, and that he was jealous of the power of Rájavardhana, the king of Kanauj, and the elder brother and predecessor of Śíláditya. He therefore lured him to a meeting and treacherously murdered him. We also learn that he was a great enemy of the Buddhists and cut down their sacred tree † (*Bodhidruma*). He must have possessed considerable power, for, after destroying the law of Buddha, he went to Patna and tried to deface a stone there which had been set up by Aśoka, and bore the marks of Śákyamuni’s feet. Lassen considers that the assassination of Rájavardhana ‡ took place in 614, the year of Śíláditya’s accession. He also holds § that Śaśāṅka must have retained his independence during Śíláditya’s reign, or otherwise he never would have ventured to cut down the sacred tree. But it seems clear that Śaśāṅka had done this long before and in the time of Śíláditya’s predecessor. The words “*dans ces derniers temps*” do not mean recently, and we are expressly told in the 6th book of the Si-yu-ki (II. 349; Beal, II, 42), that the destruction of the law and the dispersion of the monks by Śaśāṅka occurred a great many years ago. We also find the Bodhisattva, when exhorting Śíláditya to accept the crown, referring to Śaśāṅka’s previous acts in destroying the law. And at p. 251 l.c. (Beal, I, 213) we are told that Śíláditya became master of the five Indies in his sixth year. According to Mr. Fleet, Harshavardhana, *i. e.*, Śíláditya began to reign in 606 or 607. So we may presume that Śaśāṅka died not later than 613. The Si-yu-ki (p. 469; Beal, II, 122) describes the manner of his death and says it occurred a long time ago. Śaśāṅka must then, have been dead twenty or thirty years before Hiuen Tsiang went to Karna Suvarṇa. We know that there had been time to introduce Buddhism and to build a large monastery before he visited the place.

* I. 112, 235, II. 248, 349, 422, 463, 468-9; Beal, Life, 83; Si-yu-ki, I, 210-213, II, 42, 91, 118, 121-2

† Púrṇavarman irrigated it with milk, and it shot up in a night to the height of ten feet. At the time of composing the Si-yu-ki it was 44 feet high. If this account be taken as correct, a botanist might calculate the date of Śaśāṅka’s violence.

‡ He calls him Harshavardhana. Mr. Fleet holds that the accession was in 606 or 607.

§ III. 686.

The name Śaśāṅka,* does not occur in Abú'l-fazl,† or Tieffenthaler,‡ but the first has a *Shashatdhar*, and the second a *Scheschdar*. These are clearly corruptions of Śaśadhara, (the moon,) and it is quite possible that this is another form of the name Śaśāṅka. Both words mean hare-marked or hare-bearing, *i. e.*, the moon, and apparently the pilgrim translates Śaśāṅka simply by the Chinese word for moon. If this is so, the fact is very important, for Śaśadhara belonged to the line of Ādiśúra, and was the eighth in succession from him. He is said to have reigned 58 years, but the reigns of all the princes of this line seem unreasonably long. However if Śaśāṅka and Śaśadhara be identical, Ādiśúra can hardly have been later than the first half of the 6th century. There seems nothing incredible in this for Lassen§ says that he is wrongly referred to the 9th or 10th century, and that he must have lived in the beginning of the 7th century. But if he was not later than 600, he must, I think, be put back still further, for it was Ādiśúra who brought Bráhmans from Kanauj to Bengal. He could not have done this during the Āditya dynasty for they were Buddhists. Their dynasty began according to Lassen in 580, and so Ādiśúra must have reigned before that date, and perhaps was contemporary with one of the early Guptas.|| M. Saint Martin suggests that Hiuen Tsiang went out of his road to visit Karṇa Suvarṇa, on account of the connection of the neighbourhood with Vijaya and the conversion of Ceylon. This is not very likely, since Hiuen Tsiang says nothing about it, and he was not deeply interested in Ceylon, for he never went there. The fable, however, about Vijaya is interesting as showing an early connection between Bengal and Ceylon. Vijaya probably came from Singbhúm.¶ His story

* Mr. Fleet's work, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, III, for a reference to which I am indebted to Dr. Waddoll's paper, shows (p. 283), that there is an inscription of Śaśāṅka at Rohtás. With reference to this identification, however, and also to General Cunningham's remark that there is a tank in Bogra named after Śaśāṅka, it may be well to bear in mind that according to the Buchanan MS., Vol. Bhágalpur I. 183, there was a Śaśāṅka, a Kshetanri Rájá of Kharakpur, who was put to death in 1502 (910 Fasli.) [*Apud* Moutgomery Martin, II, 57. Ed.]

† *Áin* I. 413.

‡ Tieffenthaler, I. 472.

§ III. 718.

|| III. 393.

¶ His mother was the daughter of the King of Baṅga by a Kalíṅga Princess, a circumstance which points to an early connection between Bengal and the Madras coast. She was brought up in her father's city of Baṅga which presumably lay in South-east Bengal or somewhere about Samatāta. There can be no doubt that the forest of Lála where the caravan in its way to Magadha (S. Bihár) was dispersed, and she fell into the power of a lion, is the Ráñ country west of the Bhágirathí. See Upham, *Sacred books of Ceylon*, I. 69 and II, 164.

is told in Chapter VI of the Mahavansa, and in the 11th book of the Si-yu-ki. A more historical event is referred to by Wilford and Layard when they mention the local tradition that Raṅgamāṭī was destroyed by an expedition from Ceylon. This must have occurred after Hiuen Tsiang's visit to Karna Suvarna, and in my opinion, it belongs to the 12th century. I think that there is no reason to doubt the legend, for people are not in the habit of inventing disasters. But if true, it can only, I think, have occurred in the time of Parākrama Báhu, the Great. His reign is described by Turnour as having been the most martial, enterprising, and glorious in Singhalese history. He, too, seems to have been the only prince of Ceylon who carried his arms across the Bay of Bengal, or who possessed a fleet. There is an account of the expedition in the 76th Chapter of the Mahavansa.* It was directed against the king of Aramma, or Ramamma, which according to Mr. Wijesinha lay between Arracan and Siam. Five ships came to the port Kúsúmí, in the country of Ramamma and the troops "like furious elephants destroyed a great number of cocoa-nut and "other trees, and the places round about them, and burnt many "villages with fire and destroyed half of the kingdom." A Tamil general named Adhikári, who had volunteered for this service, cast anchor in the port of Papphala (Pippli?). One of the ships attacked the island of Kákadvipa† (?) or Crow Island, and brought away many of the inhabitants as prisoners to Ceylon. Arimaddana, the king of Ramamma was killed by the invaders. Perhaps his name was Ari-Mardana, *i. e.*, the trampler of foes, or it may have been Hari-Madana. (It seems worth while to note here that there was a king of Orissa who was called Madana Mahádeva, and who had a short reign of four years from 1171-75.)

Kúsúmí as the name of the port, reminds us of Wilford's statement that Raṅgamāṭī used to be called Kusumapurí. The name, however, is a common one, and was applied to Patna and other towns. The statement that Ramamma is the country between Siam and Arracan is, perhaps, only a conjecture of Mr. Knighton, though I find that Sir Arthur Phayre mentions Ram-ma-we-li as a town and country near Sandoway (J. A. S. B. XIII. 27). On the other hand, we have Ramana marked in Gastaldi's old map,‡ as a place east of Orissa and near Hijlí.

* Wijesinha's translation. Colombo, 1889. See also Lassen IV. 328.

† Probably this is Cocanada in the Madras Presidency. According to the Imperial Gazetteer of India the proper spelling is Káka-náda and the meaning is Crow-country. If the Coromandel coast was the point of attack one can see why the services of a Madras officer were valuable.

‡ Cluverius mentions Ramama as the capital of Orissa and as a mart famous for ivory and precious stones. He also says that the country was rich in salt. See

It may also be worth while mentioning that *Sudhárám* is a native name for the district of *Noakháli*. I do not know its age or origin, but it may mean *Suddha-áráma*, the place of delightful rest, and if so the last half of the name approaches the *Arámma* of *Turnour*. One reason given for the expedition was that "the king of *Ramámma* had obstructed persons who were bringing presents from a king of *India* to *Ceylon*." On one occasion when a certain chief of *India*, *Kassapa* by name, sent presents unto him (*Parákrama*) of great value, with a letter written on a leaf of gold, he hindered the men who bore them from landing and then caused the presents to be taken from them with the letter and sent into the city with great dishonour.* This looks like the action of a king of *Orissa* or *Bengal*, who would have control of the ports, such as *Támraliptí*, &c. It appears, too, that the expedition ravaged the coast of *Coromandel*, and so may easily have also attacked *Bengal* and *Orissa*. However this may be, and allowing that the expedition was directed against *Siam* or *Cambodia*, it must have been easy for the armament, on its way to or from the seat of war, to sail or march up to *Raṅgamáṭi* and destroy it. It is not likely that the ships would steer right across the Bay, or sail direct from *Ceylon* to *Siam*. It is to be hoped that some day *Kákadvípa*, *Papphala*, &c., will be satisfactorily identified.

As for the date of the expedition it was certainly not earlier than the 16th year of *Parákrama Báhu's* reign. According to *Turnour* his accession took place in 1153, so that the 16th year would be 1169. According to the *Wijesinha*, *Parákrama's* reign began in 1164, which would give 1180 as the 16th year. *Lassen* adopts *Turnour's* date of accession, but places the expedition in the year 1172. We are told that five months were employed in making preparations, and that provisions for twelve months were collected. If *Mr. Wijesinha's* date of accession then be correct, the expedition may have been as late as 1182 or '83. Under any circumstances it would be some years before the *Muhammadan* invasion of *Bengal*.

According to the tradition collected by *Capt. Layard* there was a king of *Raṅgamáṭi* called *Karṇa Sena*. If this was so, he cannot have been the *Karṇa* who gave his name to the city. The latter was, perhaps, the *Karṇa* of the *Mahábhárata*, who was sometimes called *Karṇa Dátta*, and was half brother of the *Páṇḍavas*. He was king of *Aṅga*, and had seats at *Bhágálpur* and *Monghyr*. No such name as *Karṇa* occurs in the lists of the *Vaidya* kings of *Gaur*.

Brum's ed., *Amsterdam*, p. 332. *Philip Clavier* or *Cluverius* was one of the most celebrated of our early geographers. He was born at *Dantzic* in 1580, and died at *Leyden* in 1623.

* *Wijesinha's Mahávansa*, p. 228.

NOTE ON DR. WADDELL'S PAPER.*

I did not know of or see Dr. Waddell's paper until I had nearly finished my own. He proposes to identify Kārṇa Suvarṇa with Kañchannagar, near Burdwan. He has taken pains with the subject and his article contains some valuable information, but I think that his identification is quite untenable. It seems to me unfortunate that when Dr. Fergusson † and he had the clue in their hands they should have let it slip. Both of them refer to Raṅgamāṭī, in Murshidábád; but both of them put it aside. Fergusson thought that the capital might afterwards have been transferred to Raṅgamāṭī, and that in this way it got the name of Kārṇa Suvarṇa, but he would not accept it as the place visited by Hien Tsiang, because he thought Hwui-li's account of the route to it incorrect. Apparently, too, he failed to notice that Raṅgamāṭī was equivalent to the name of the monastery mentioned by Hien Tsiang. He chose Nagar in Bīrbhūm, a place which I have seen and which I think, has no claim to be Kārṇa Suvarṇa. But a writer who refused to believe that the Tāmra-lipti of Hien Tsiang was Tamluk cannot be regarded as a safe guide.

Dr. Waddell has rejected Raṅgamāṭī partly, as I conceive, because he has never seen it, and so does not know the evidence of ancient greatness which it exhibits. His words are as follows:—"The proposed identification with the fort of Kuru, near the village of Raṅgamāṭī, in Murshidabad district, about 130 miles to the north-east of Tamluk, is quite untenable, as it is so out of keeping with the pilgrim's text, and possesses nothing suggestive of the site, except the local name of Raṅgamāṭī, and having proceeded so far northwards, the subsequent journey of 700 li to the south-west could not carry the pilgrim to the frontier, much less to the capital of Orissa, his next stage.‡

I do not know what is meant by the phrase "proposed identification" in this extract. So far as I know, Raṅgamāṭī has never been proposed before. Perhaps Colonel Yule made such a proposal, but if so, the reference given by him, J. R. A. S. XVIII. 395, is wrong. The only reference given by Dr. Waddell is to Captain Layard's paper, but certainly that says nothing about Hien Tsiang. It was hardly possible, if not quite impossible, that it should, for Layard's paper was published in our Society's *Journal* in 1853, and M. Julien's translation of the biography only appeared in that year, and this translation of the Si-yu-ki not till 1858. Nor do I know what is meant by the "fort of Kuru." Nobody has ever used that name or spoken about the Kurus in connec-

* Published by the Government of Bengal last year, as an Appendix to a paper on Pátaliputra.

† J. R. A. S., VI. 248.

‡ p. 25.

tion with Raṅgamāṭī. As to the distance-difficulty, I quite admit that so far Burdwan may agree as well with Hiuen Tsiang's statement as Raṅgamāṭī. I do not think, however, that it has any superiority in this respect. I do not know why it should be assumed that Jājpur was the capital of Orissa in Hiuen Tsiang's time, or that his distances are for capitals and not for the confines of kingdoms. The direction of Burdwan from Tamluk is a little more westerly than that of Raṅgamāṭī, but still it is mainly north. Besides Dr. Waddell takes no notice of the route given in the biography, *viz.*, that from Paṅḍuá, or from the monastery five miles to the west of it. That route certainly agrees better with Raṅgamāṭī than with Burdwan. However, I lay little stress on directions and still less on distances. The two strong points in favour of Raṅgamāṭī are—first, it used to be called the Fort of Karṇa Suvarṇa, and secondly, that Raṅgamāṭī is an equivalent for Rakta-Viṭi and Lo-to-wei-chi, or Lo-to-mo-chi. Raṅgamāṭī is not the only place in the neighbourhood which is associated with Karṇa. The village and *tháná* of Go-Karṇa, *i. e.*, the cowshed of Karṇa, is close by.

On the other hand, Kañchannagar seems to be an obscure place, a sort of suburb of Burdwan. No evidence is adduced of its having been "the traditional capital of the country." I do not know who Belisur was, but I see that Captain Layard says there was a tank at Raṅgamāṭī called the Bel Talao. Probably the name is connected in both instances with the Bael tree, which is sacred to Siva. There is also at Raṅgamāṭī the almost obliterated site of an ancient tank called the Jamuná Tank and in which a curious image figured by Captain Layard was found.

Kañchannagar is a common name in Bengal, and has its own distinct meaning, *viz.*, the city of gold. I do not see how it can be twisted into meaning the city of Karṇa Suvarṇa.

P. S.—I have lately come upon an interesting piece of evidence about the antiquity of the name of Karṇa Suvarṇa. In the genealogy of Rájá Rádhá Kánta Deva, prefixed to the 8th volume of the *Sabdakalpadruma*, and also in the sketch of his life by the editors of the second edition, it is stated that his earliest known ancestor, Śrī Hari Deva, was a resident of Karṇa Suvarṇa, near Murshidábád. Rájá Rádhá Kánta was the twenty-fifth in descent from Śrī Hari, and was himself born in 1783, so that Śrī Hari probably lived in the 12th century. Rájá Rádhá Kánta lived to at least the age of 76, and if we allow 26 years for each generation of his ancestors, Śrī Hari may have lived at Karṇa Suvarṇa before its destruction by the troops of Parákrama Báhu.

For convenience of reference I subjoin Wilford's notes of Raṅgamāṭī in the 9th volume of the *Researches*: "Tradition says that the

“king of Laṅká, which implies either the country of the Mahárájah of Lapági or Ceylon, but more probably the first, invaded the country of Bengal with a powerful fleet and sailed up the Ganges as far as Raṅgamáṭi, then called Kusumapurí, and a considerable place where the King or Mahárája often resided. The invaders plundered the country and destroyed the city. This happened long before the invasion of Bengal by the Musalmans, and seems to coincide with the time of the invasion of the peninsula by the Mahárája of Lapági. This information was procured at my request by the late Lieutenant Hoare, who was remarkably fond of inquiries of this sort, and to whom I am indebted for several historical inquiries and other particulars relating to the geography of the Gangetic provinces.”

Apparently Lieutenant Hoare is the officer referred to as Captain Hoare in the 7th vol. of the *Researches*, p. 175, as having taken part in procuring copies of the inscriptions on the Dihlí pillar. Wilford thought that Laṅká might mean Lapági, *i. e.*, Java, because two Arabian travellers of the 9th century mentioned by Roundot had referred to the king of Lapági's having devastated the coast of India. But there seems no reason for supposing that Laṅká ever meant any other place than Ceylon. Layard, writing in 1853, says, he too was told of the Laṅká expedition, but with a different version. Unfortunately he does not give the version, but, perhaps, it was only that the place was Ceylon and not Java. Layard objects to Lieutenant Hoare's account that Raṅgamáṭi was formerly called Kusumapura, but it is just possible that it was both called Kusumapura and Karṇa Suvarṇa. Or the Ceylonese may have been mistaken, like Lieutenant Hoare, and written Kusumi instead of Karṇa Suvarṇa.